

Date: Sun, 1 Aug 93 00:12:52 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #275  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sun, 1 Aug 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 275

Today's Topics:

                    ARRL and it's members  
                    ARRL Internet connection (2 msgs)  
                            Code/NoCode  
                            CW Privilages  
                    CW Privileges (Was: Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)  
                            nocode started when?  
                    Technicians can use CW, was Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 30 Jul 93 17:30:40 GMT  
From: spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!psuvax1!vogon1!wa3wbu!frackit!ka3uzr!  
daveh@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: ARRL and it's members  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jeg7e@livia.acs.Virginia.EDU (Jon Gefaell) writes:

> I've directed prospective new Amateurs to email Luck Hurder asking for  
> the New Hams packet which is supposed to include local testing session  
> information, etc... It was never received.  
>  
> The same fellow persevered and obtained his license, then sent mail again  
> requesting the Public Service Manual, again, it never arrived.

Just another datapoint. I emailed a request for a prospective ham packet

to Luck and received one a short time later. Next I sent an email request for the Public Service Manual and received it also.

One problem with email requests as with snail mail, is whether or not it ever made it to the recipient's mailbox. 73 de ka3uzr

Dave Hultberg KA3UZR | vogon1!compnect!frackit!ka3uzr!daveh@psuvax1.psu.edu  
Fidonet: 1:270/101.28 | Assistant Scoutmaster, Troop 196, Keystone Area Council

Brotherhood Member Susquehannock Lodge 11 \\\ / \\\ / \\\ / | ASTA

-----  
Date: 31 Jul 93 17:06:51 GMT  
From: amusing!goldmine!elt@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: ARRL Internet connection  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1885@arrl.org> jbbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:  
>In rec.radio.amateur.misc, datwyler@moons.sim.es.com (Doug Datwyler) writes:  
>>I agree that the ARRL should be here, as they are promoting the hobby,  
>>adding to discussions, fueling flames, dousing flames, etc....  
>>  
>>This discussion should end soon.  
>  
>Yes, please. The "vote" in news and email is one against, everyone  
>else for. Case closed.  
>-----  
>Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org  
>American Radio Relay League |  
>225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

Yeah, in news.admin they fight for the right of child molesters to use usenet too. Won't comment on that... but in almost every newsgroup an organization gets flamed for promoting its own bussiness on the net. But I'm glad you're here. How's the saying go? "Keep your friends close and your enemies closer." I fact, I recommend that anyone that is supicious or unloving of the ARRL join. I did.

--

Ed Taychert (AA2MZ) | Never be good at anything you don't like doing.  
elt@irony.com | Disclaimer: My boss doesn't know I use his computer.

-----  
Date: 1 Aug 93 05:09:17 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!olivea!news.bu.edu!david@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: ARRL Internet connection  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I have recently tried to reply to a post from someone at arrl.org and ended up getting the mail back as undeliverable. Using nslookup, the domain arrl.org does not appear to exist. Should I be routing this mail through some other site? Any help would be appreciated.

>David [call letters pending, week two and counting :-)]<

--

David R. Gagnon, MD MPH	david@med-busphed.bu.edu
Boston University School of Public Health	gagnon@math.bu.edu
Boston, Massachusetts	(617) 638-5172

"ecrasez l'infamie"

-----

Date: 1 Aug 93 06:02:14 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!  
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!cleveland.Freenet.Edu!ak842@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Code/NoCode  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In a previous article, robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) says:

>The ARES group you spoke of must be run by the same group as the one here  
>in Houston, because the incidents you cited parallel those which have  
>occurred in the recent past here. And some wonder why I refuse to return  
>to Two Meters. Guess no further!

>

> --Robert

>

Again, I'm sorry to hear that.

I guess we have one advantage in the fact that our EC has been trained by Cuyahoga County and does more at the EOC than ham radio. I'm not real sure what some of the other duties are, but I'm under the impression that he'd be activated regardless of the necessity of ARES.

I guess only professionals run a professional organization. I didn't realize how lucky we are. Hmm, I always assumed that ARES was well-run... oh well. More great PR by the amateur community. Maybe it should be required that all EC's have some sort of required training.

--

-- Douglas A. Dever -- ak842@po.cwru.edu 73 de N8VUR  
s9000159@llohoio.ll.pbs.org (Hate Mail to This Address Please)  
floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Fan Mail to This Address Please)  
QSO on 444.700/R or 146.82/R anytime!

-----  
Date: 31 Jul 93 23:51:05 GMT  
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: CW Privileges  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <harp.4.0@bnr.ca> harp@bnr.ca (Alan Harp) writes:  
>I guess for all I care you could give up the phone privileges reserved for  
>EXTRA class. I don't know with out checking where it is.  
>  
>What would happen if all phone privileges were open to no-code techs.  
>I think there would be solid QRM and people who sound like Herbie  
>from one end to the other. Yes another CB-Band.

There would be no change - It can't get much worse than it is. Really it  
would improve, there would be a lower % of jerks than it has now.

--  
Rod Anderson N0NZO | "I do not think the United States government  
Boulder, CO | is responsible for the fact that a bunch of  
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu | fanatics decided to kill themselves"  
satellite N0NZO on ao-16 | Slick Willie the Compassionate

-----  
Date: 30 Jul 1993 06:30 EDT  
From: haven.umd.edu!cs.umd.edu!skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!  
stocker@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: CW Privileges (Was: Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1893@arrl.org>, ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes...  
>  
>Techs can operate CW. Those with the HF endorsement can do it on HF;  
>those who have not passed the code test can still operate CW on  
>VHF. There is nothing in the regulations that prohibit CW use  
>by no-code Technicians.  
>  
>73, Ed  
>  
>-----  
>Ed Hare, KA1CV ehare@arrl.org

>American Radio Relay League  
>225 Main St.  
>Newington, CT 06111 "You will never put the puzzle together  
>(203) 666-1541 - voice if you keep putting all of the pieces  
>ARRL Laboratory Supervisor back in the box." Colleen  
>RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing  
>-----

I'd like to add my thoughts on this since I am a Tech and not a Tech+. I really am having a difficult time understanding the thread that Tech's should be allowed a part of the HF band to hone their code skills. We have a lot of frequency allocation available to us and we could certainly use it for morse code. Others have pointed out the existing weak signal areas and these are certainly available to us and more of us ought to use them and not just FM. I might add that currently much of the CW in these portions of the band are too fast for most Techs and even for some of the Tech+. However, some of the people are nice enough to slow down if though they stand a chance of having fewer contacts as part of it.

The issue of code doesn't, in my opinion, have anything to do with Tech on HF (I don't think we need it unless we meet the code requirement which currently is an international requirement) but rather whether the code is the only differentiator that should be used to separate license classes. I would prefer a more comprehensive theory portion, then an optional 25 question test on specific communications mode and operating procedures. I would opt to have 5 wpm for general and 13wpm for advanced and extra. I don't really see why the 20 wpm for extra is a good determiner of extra knowledge. Look at the theory for Advanced vs Extra. I think that the theory for extra should be at a very high level. My personal view is that should be the determiner.

Erich  
N3OXM

-----  
Date: 31 Jul 93 13:31:22 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: nocode started when?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> I was just wondering when the nocode technician class  
> licensing started? Month ??, 198? (or 199?)

02/14/1991

Peter Laws | "The '90s are gonna make the '60s|plaws@uafhp.uark.edu  
n5uwy@ka5bm1.ar.usa.noam| look like the '50s" --D. Hopper|plaws@uafsysb.bitnet

-----  
Date: 1 Aug 1993 05:51:46 GMT  
From: europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!  
cleveland.Freenet.Edu!ak842@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Technicians can use CW, was Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In a previous article, robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) says:

>  
>Typical. Look what happened with the skyrocketing trade deficit with  
>Japan. Again, nothing.

Don't start me on that subject! :) Eventually americans  
will be fporced to wake up and relize they're selling this nation!  
Japan would never do that.. they have pride in themselves.. they also  
have a closed market. Hmm.. I'll have to go see Rising Sun,  
but I doubt that they dealt with that subject as must as the book  
did.

>  
>Also, does anyone even USE CW above 30 MHZ? Not I. Seems pointless to  
>maintain it as a requirement for operation on those bands, doesn't it?  
>But it also seems pointless for those who have not demonstrated Morse  
>skill to have access to bands that are clearly international in nature.  
>Just my opinion, take it or leave it.  
>  
> --Robert  
>

Hmm... I've heard 2 people using CW on 2m around here...  
I was one of them.. and gee, I'm a no-code. IN any case... I guess  
someone around here is trying to start a nightly CW net on 2m so that  
some of us will get our speed up and upgrade.

I think that the US should continue with the current  
code requirements. VHF/UHF is local by nature. HF is not.  
HF rules should continue to be dictated by the current  
international agreements... I have never said otherwise.

Man, I can't wait until power is total restored to this county...

I'm still waiting for my usual usenet feed to come back on-line...  
Called him today... 4 days without power, and not expecting it  
until Tuesday.

--

\_\_ Douglas A. Dever \_\_ ak842@po.cwru.edu 73 de N8VUR  
s9000159@llohoio.ll.pbs.org (Hate Mail to This Address Please)  
floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Fan Mail to This Address Please)  
QS0 on 444.700/R or 146.82/R anytime!

-----

Date: 1 Aug 93 00:05:29 GMT  
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <238345\$cp4@senator-bedfellow.MIT.EDU>,  
<1993Jul29.122119.9251@ee.surrey.ac.uk>,  
<930730.111225.8M3.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>  
Subject : Re: Real CBers

In article <930730.111225.8M3.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com> system@garlic.sbs.com  
(Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>M.Willis@ee.surrey.ac.uk (Mike Willis) writes:

>

>> Yes. CODELESS != CLUELESS.

>>

>>

>> All this stuff amuses me as in the UK we have had a codeless licence for many  
>> years. A large number of technical competants have taken advantage of this.  
>> VHF upwards is so much more rewarding than HF.

The clueless ones are hams without a degree in electrical engineering!  
Many fools can learn Morse but it takes about 4 years of collage to get  
the engineering degree.

There are two classes of hams the Technicianas and the Clueless Coded

>Two things, this is the United States, not the United Kingdom and  
>secondly, to each his own. Some people are perfectly happy to remain in  
>VHF/UHF and others aren't.

>

>The problem with this is that you get people who came in under the  
>no-code license, then scream because they want HF access without any  
>additional effort. Hence, clueless. :)

No, we think that 13 wmp is harassment, set the morse at 5 wpm.

foolish sig deleted

--

Rod Anderson	N0NZO		"I do not think the United States government
Boulder, CO			is responsible for the fact that a bunch of
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu			fanatics decided to kill themselves"
satellite	N0NZO on ao-16		Slick Willie the Compassionate

-----

Date: Fri, 30 Jul 1993 13:26:52 GMT  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!  
dgg.cr.usgs.gov!bodoh@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CAtu1A.Mrz@hpbbird.bbn.hp.com>,  
<1993Jul29.133503.1144@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>, <1993Jul29.152316.1530@mwk.com>--  
Subject : Re: Profanity was(Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)

In article <1993Jul29.152316.1530@mwk.com>, gleason@mwk.com writes:  
> In article <1993Jul29.133503.1144@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>, bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (Tom  
Bodoh) writes:

>  
> > boards as components. And when the defective board is sent in, typically  
> > it is either thrown away or the problem is found with a test jig. Someone  
>  
> I thought that when the defective boards were sent in, they were  
> dusted off, a "This board has been machine tested" tag was attached,  
> and then they were shipped back out...  
>  
> ;-)  
>  
> Lee K. Gleason N5ZMR

--

This would be funny if it weren't true. We have our own engineering staff and they support most of our systems using spares which we stock. It's nice since we can get machines back up fast, but then we have to get the boards repaired - and a good percentage of the time they come back with a note that says something obscure like "checked" and the board is still broken. We do write up very concise descriptions of the problem but I suppose that if their test jig doesn't find it, it must not be a problem.



Some companies do understand this problem though. Data General told me that they track boards by serial number and after a board comes back for the same problem three times, the board is scrapped.

Another annoyance is that diagnostics have not kept up with advances in software and hardware - for the most part. It is very rare that I have seen a diagnostic indicate a hardware problem when the problem is obviously hardware in nature and is resolved by swapping a board. I guess that the nature of this problem is that diagnostics cannot simulate every possible combination of events that can cause a failure to appear. The other problem is that too many engineers trust these diagnostics and will swear that it must be a software problem since the diagnostic didn't find anything. I then point out to them that the defective software is their diagnostic!

```
+++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer, Hughes STX, NOY?? (in the mail) +
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)
```

```
+
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
+
```

```
+++++
```

-----  
Date: 29 Jul 1993 17:59:41 -0400

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!news.delphi.com!  
not-for-mail@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul27.162241.6032@linus.mitre.org>, <237asi\$bc0@news.delphi.com>,  
<1993Jul29.130948.555@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>

Subject : Re: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!

bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:

>Nah - the VEC's would send it in ASCII and the FCC would want to feed their  
>dinosaur mainframe EBCDIC...

>Seriously - You would think that this would save everyone time and money. The  
>FCC has a proposal to do something like this, but since they continue to  
>require the signatures, they are holding out for a standard for signature  
>storage and verification - and that may be years away.

Offhand, I think the most viable alternative would be to allow the VEC  
to issue licenses -- either temporary or permanent. I say this because  
the VECs are in closer connection to the FCC and would be better equipped

to issue non-duplicate callsigns, preferably via an electronic link to the FCC.

And despite what some others have said, I have no complaints with either the local VEs or the VECs. The VEs at the session I attended really did a good job and were very helpful. If I could afford it, I'd buy the entire crew lunch. At the least I will take doughnuts with me when I upgrade to General -- they really deserve it!

-- Greg KE4DPX

-----  
Date: 31 Jul 93 05:15:10 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!olivea!apple.com!apple.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <gBgc8B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>,  
<1993Jul27.172718.23080@newsgate.sps.mot.com>, <1993Jul30.211551.433@btree.uucp>~  
Subject : Re: Written CW (Was: Re: Real CBers)

bly@btree.uucp (Roger Bly) writes:

>What? Your news reader doesn't have a "DECODE MORRIS" option. Better  
>get the new rev. Will decode morris to ascii text or sound.

But, does it convert ".... .." into ":-)" ? .... ..

73,

Kok Chen, AA6TY  
Apple Computer, Inc.

kchen@apple.com

-----  
Date: 1 Aug 93 05:43:57 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!  
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!cleveland.Freenet.Edu!ak842@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CAxJt5.B3K@egr.uri.edu>, <23d03v\$quv@usenet.INS.CWRU.Edu>,  
<1993Jul31.114333.16818@anomaly.sbs.com>vela  
Reply-To : ak842@cleveland.Freenet.Edu (Douglas Dever)  
Subject : Re: Code/NoCode

In a previous article, kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) says:

>  
>When it comes to emergency services, amateurs have this noble,  
>conceited concept on how they are "so important" to the disaster  
>relief effort of communities. I hate to break it to you, you're not.  
>  
>MD

Mike... you have yet to tell me something I don't know.  
In fact, I've told many people this very thing. However, in Cleveland  
ARES has a defined role. In times of disaster we are activated  
by the Cuyahoga County EOC. (Cuyahoga Emergency Management Assistance  
Center or CEMAC) We provide support of a non-priority however  
still essential nature. Police and fire can handle themselves.

You know what I did all day Friday. I sat outside the City of  
Euclid Service Garage in a car because there was not a lot of  
room and a good deal of people and no power, so no lighting.  
I informed the Scene Commander that I was there and where I  
would be. Basically, whenever the City of Euclid needed to get  
in touch with the EOC they would come out and tell me. Phone  
links were intermittent so I sat as a backup link. And when  
called upon asked county to send more Backhoes or Trucks or  
relay something to the National Guard working in the area.  
Non-emergency traffic, but still necessary. No Kojak lights.  
No parading around and getting in the way.

We try and run a professional shop and stay in the background.  
I think we are succeeding here... ARES is officially called upon  
and is defined by CEMAC in a disaster./ ARES also has a working  
agreement with every suburb of Cleveland and with Cleveland  
if ever needed. Otherwise.. I just stay out of the way.

Sorry to disappoint you.. I have no mis-conceptions regarding  
my role... They could live without me.. but it helps when I can  
be there... I'm not in charge, I'm not a cop. I'm a backup  
link. That's the hardest thing to get through some of these  
guys heads though.. is that they're not in charge and they're not  
a cop... they're a backup. I realize the importance of a back-up  
system and am happy to not play a cop, and to not think I'm in  
charge.

I'm sorry to hear that the ARES in your area doesn't operate  
like that.... I really am because it's terrible PR for those  
of us who ARE making a difference.

--

-- Douglas A. Dever -- ak842@po.cwru.edu 73 de N8VUR  
s9000159@llohoio.ll.pbs.org (Hate Mail to This Address Please)  
floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Fan Mail to This Address Please)  
QSO on 444.700/R or 146.82/R anytime!

-----

Date: 29 Jul 93 15:23:16 CST  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!sdd.hp.com!swrinde!  
menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!mwk!gleason@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul22.020659.17371@anomaly.sbs.com>,  
<CAtu1A.Mrz@hpbbrd.bbn.hp.com>, <1993Jul29.133503.1144@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>gleaso  
Subject : Re: Profanity was(Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)

In article <1993Jul29.133503.1144@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>, bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (Tom  
Bodoh) writes:

> boards as components. And when the defective board is sent in, typically  
> it is either thrown away or the problem is found with a test jig. Someone

I thought that when the defective boards were sent in, they were  
dusted off, a "This board has been machine tested" tag was attached,  
and then they were shipped back out...

;-)

Lee K. Gleason N5ZMR  
Control-G Consultants  
gleason@mwk.com

-----

Date: Fri, 30 Jul 1993 19:51:43 GMT  
From: psinntp!uuneo!sugar!jreese@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22rzd8INNn7g@topaz.bds.com>, <eya97B9w165w@nraven.wariat.org>,  
<23bgv2INNd11@network.ucsd.edu>c  
Subject : Re: ARRL and its members

In article <23bgv2INNd11@network.ucsd.edu> brian@nothing.ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor)  
writes:

>The clear counter to what you and I and others see the ARRL doing wrong  
>is for us to petition and comment on petitions \*DIRECTLY\* before the FCC.

Hear, hear! It's about the only way you have to make a voice heard in Washington...

>Whether you are a member or not, the ARRL claims to represent you.  
>It therefore behooves you to criticize them when you believe they are  
>wrong, and to laud them when you believe they are right. Be sure the  
>ARRL knows what you think - and if your non-membership is a symbol of  
>your disgust with the organization, be sure you have told them so.

I did just this in the form of a letter to Dave Sumner. He didn't even bother to reply...further adding to my disgust.

>\*I have made no secret of this: the reason I'm not a member of the  
>ARRL is that I believe that many of their actions do not represent my  
>views as an amateur, and are in many ways harmful to the service.  
>I have felt this way ever since the imposition of the repeater policies  
>of the early 70's, and continue to believe that whenever the ARRL is  
>faced with a new technology, their first reaction is to suppress or  
>contain it.

Ditto. Couldn't have said it better myself.

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Bad times bring out the best in Texans, good times  
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | bring out the worst." --Molly Ivins

-----  
Date: 31 Jul 93 16:28:47 GMT  
From: europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!  
news.kei.com!ddsw1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <239cn9INNuf7@emx.cc.utexas.edu>, <2404@indep1.UUCP>,  
<CB0tpp.Is7@news.Hawaii.Edu>.gtefs  
Subject : Re: ARRL and \*its\* members

In article <CB0tpp.Is7@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

>In article <2404@indep1.UUCP> clifto@indep1.UUCP (Cliff Sharp) writes:  
>>I would, too. I've disagreed with most everything the ARRL has ever done  
>  
>Cliff,  
> You say that you disagree with most everything the ARRL has ever done;  
>over what period of time does this cover? Since the conception of the

Okay, more specifically, ever since I've been watching (since I was initially licensed in 1965).

>ARRL? Can you specifically state ALL the decisions the League made prior to  
>you getting licensed and after you received your license? And which of  
>those do you disagree with? Be specific now!

Before just recently I had the bad habit of not noting specifics, and when asked couldn't cite them. But what comes to mind is Incentive Licensing, the ARRL's support of publishing the test pools, and their perennial push to lower standards and requirements for license tests. Other than those specifics, the only thing that comes to memory is the aggravation I felt every time I heard another ARRL suggestion, a "not again!" feeling not unlike hearing that Congress is back in session.

The doom-and-gloom approach ARRL frequently takes to promoting their ideas grates on my nerves, too. As I remember, when I was initially licensed, there were 240,000 hams, and so far as I know the number of hams hasn't fallen below that since. Yet ARRL is constantly reminding us how our numbers are falling off and how we need to relax regulations, testing requirements, etc. to increase them.

Not to say that some good hasn't come from ARRL, but, like PRB-1, it isn't always a lasting good.

> Care to seriously speculate if ham radio would even exist today if  
>we hadn't have had a national organization that tried to represent  
>the majority of amateurs for the last (guessing) 75 years?

One of two things; either we'd be crowded into a very small tidbit of spectrum (if any at all), or we'd be better off. But somewhere, someone would have started a movement that at least had the potential of going national, even if it took someone as controversial as Wayne Green to do it. Perhaps an alliance of local clubs would have formed. Whatever, I can't imagine that ham radio could have existed this long without \_forming\_ a national organization.

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp   |
|   WA9PDM     |      Use whichever one works                               |
+-----+
```

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #275

\*\*\*\*\*